REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's comments detailed in the Final Office Action dated 01 December 2003, which have greatly assisted Applicant in responding. The following remarks are numbered following the Examiner's Final Office Action numbers. Claims 1-5, 8-25, 31, and 33-35 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 12, 13, 19, 20, 31 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application as preliminarily amended.

In The Claims:

1. In the Final Office Action dated 01 December 2003, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 5, 8, 19, 31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,317 to VENTURINI.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended independent Claims 1, 19 and 31 specifically recite that the first communication is directed to a communication device associated with the user and that the message-indicating device "and said communication device are separate devices." This distinct feature of the message-indicating device, fully supported by the detailed description of the invention, is unique to the invention. The distinct feature specified in amended independent Claims 1, 19 and 31 is neither disclosed nor suggested by VENTURINI. Therefore, the subject matter in independent Claims 1, 19, 31 are patentably distinguishable from the cited reference and thus should be allowed.

Claims 5 and 8, which depend directly or indirectly from the amended independent Claim 1, should also be allowed for the same reasons as stated above.

2. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over VENTURINI as applied to Claim 1, and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,418,305 to NEUSTEIN.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 2 and 3 depend directly or indirectly from amended independent Claim 1. Claims 2 and 3 now comprise the distinct feature that the message-indicating device "and said communication device are separate devices," which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This distinct feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by VENTURINI or NEUSTEIN, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 1 is allowable, Claims 2 and 3 should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.

3. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over VENTURINI, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,363,431 to SCHULL.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 4 depends directly from the amended independent Claim 1. Claim 4 now comprises the distinct feature that the message-indicating device "and said communication device are separate devices," which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This distinct feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by VENTURINI or SCHULL, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 1 is allowable, Claim 4 should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.

4. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over VENTURINI, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,918,158 to LUPORTA.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 9 depends indirectly from the amended independent Claim 1. Claim 9 now comprises the distinct feature that the message-indicating device "and said communication device are separate devices," which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This distinct feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by VENTURINI or LUPORTA, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 1 is allowable, Claim 9 should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.

5. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over VENTURINI, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,838,226 to HOUGGY.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 10 depends directly from the amended independent Claim 1. Claim 10 now comprises the distinct feature that the message-indicating device "and said communication device are separate devices," which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This distinct feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by VENTURINI or HOUGGY, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 1 is allowable, Claim 10 should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.

6. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over VENTURINI, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,485 to HOMAN.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 11 depends directly from the amended independent Claim 1. Claim 11 now comprises the distinct that the message-indicating device "and said communication device are separate devices," which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This distinct feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by VENTURINI or

HOMAN, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 1 is allowable, Claim 11 should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.

7. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over VENTURINI, in view of NEUSTEIN.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended independent Claim 12 specifically recites that the communication is directed to a communication device associated with the user and that the first message-indicating device "and said communication device are separate devices." This distinct feature of the first message-indicating device, fully supported by the detailed description of the invention, is unique to the invention. The distinct feature specified in amended independent Claim 12 cannot be found in VENTURINI or NEUSTEIN, nor is it taught or suggested by any of the cited references or any combination thereof. The subject matter of Claim 12 is also fully supported by the disclosure and is patentably distinguishable from the cited references, taken alone or in combination. Therefore, independent Claim 12 should be allowed.

8. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 13 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over VENTURINI, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,313,733 to KYTE.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended independent Claim 13 specifically recites that the first communication is directed to a communication device associated with the user and that the first message-indicating device "and said communication device are separate devices." This distinct feature of the first message-indicating device, fully supported by the detailed description of the invention, is unique to the invention. The distinct feature specified in amended independent Claim 13 cannot be found in VENTURINI or KYTE, nor is it taught or suggested by any of the cited references or any combination thereof. The subject matter of Claim 13 is also fully supported by the disclosure and is patentably distinguishable from the cited references, taken alone or in combination. Therefore, independent Claim 13 should be allowed.

Claim 17 depends directly from the amended independent Claim 13. Claim 17 now comprises the distinct feature that the first message-indicating device "and said communication device are separate devices," which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This distinct feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by VENTURINI or KYTE, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 13 is allowable, Claim 17 should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.

9. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over VENTURINI, in view of KYTE and further in view of NEUSTEIN.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 14 and 15 depend directly or indirectly from the amended independent Claim 13. Claims 14 and 15 now comprise the distinct feature that the first message-indicating device "and said communication device are separate devices," which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This distinct feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by VENTURINI, KYTE or NEUSTEIN, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 13 is allowable, Claims 14 and 15 should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.

10. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over VENTURINI, in view of KYTE and further in view of SCHULL.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 16 depends directly from the amended independent Claim 13. Claim 16 now comprises the distinct feature that the first message-indicating device "and said communication device are separate devices," which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This distinct feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by

VENTURINI, KYTE or SCHULL, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 13 is allowable, Claim 16 should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.

11. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over VENTURINI, in view of KYTE and further in view of HOUGGY.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 18 depends indirectly from the amended independent Claim 13. Claim 18 now comprises the distinct feature that the first message-indicating device "and said communication device are separate devices," which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This distinct feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by VENTURINI, KYTE or HOUGGY, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 13 is allowable, Claim 18 should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.

12. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over VENTURINI, in view of NEUSTEIN.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The amended independent Claim 20 specifically recites that the communication is directed to a communication device associated with a user and that the apparatus "and said communication device are separate devices." This distinct feature of the apparatus, fully supported by the detailed description of the invention, is unique to the invention. The distinct feature specified in amended independent Claim 20 cannot be found in VENTURINI or NEUSTEIN, nor is it taught or suggested by any of the cited references or any combination thereof. The subject matter of Claim 20 is also fully supported by the disclosure and is patentably distinguishable from the cited references, taken alone or in combination. Therefore, independent Claim 20 should be allowed.

Claim 21 depends directly from the amended independent Claim 20. Claim 21 now comprises the distinct feature that the apparatus "and said communication device are separate devices," which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This distinct feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by VENTURINI or NEUSTEIN, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 20 is allowable, Claim 21 should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.

13. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over VENTURINI, in view of NEUSTEIN and further in view of SCHULL.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 22 and 23 depend directly or indirectly from the amended independent Claim 20. Claims 22 and 23 now comprise the distinct feature that the apparatus "and said communication device are separate devices," which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This distinct feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by VENTURINI, NEUSTEIN or SCHULL, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 20 is allowable, Claims 22 and 23 should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.

14. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over VENTURINI, in view of NEUSTEIN and further in view of KYTE.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 24 and 25 depend directly from the amended independent Claim 20. Claims 24 and 25 now comprise the distinct feature that the apparatus "and said communication device are separate devices," which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This distinct feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by VENTURINI, NEUSTEIN or KYTE, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 20 is allowable, Claims 24 and 25 should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.

15. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over VENTURINI, in view of KYTE and further in view of HOUGGY.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 33 depends directly from the amended independent Claim 31. Claim 33 now comprises the distinct feature that the first waiting indication device "and said communication device are separate devices," which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This distinct feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by VENTURINI, KYTE or HOUGGY, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 31 is allowable, Claim 33 should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.

16. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over VENTURINI, in view of KYTE and further in view of HOMAN.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 34 depends directly from the amended independent Claim 31. Claim 34 now comprises the distinct feature that the first waiting indication device "and said communication device are separate devices," which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This distinct feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by

VENTURINI, KYTE or HOMAN, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 31 is allowable, Claim 34 should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.

17. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over VENTURINI, in view of NEUSTEIN.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 35 depends directly from the amended independent Claim 31. Claim 35 now comprises the distinct feature that the first waiting indication device apparatus "and said communication device are separate devices," which is fully supported by the detailed description of the invention. This distinct feature is neither disclosed, nor suggested by VENTURINI or NEUSTEIN, nor suggested by any combination of the cited references. Because the amended independent Claim 31 is allowable, Claim 35 should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all pending claims are patentable and are now in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael A. Glenn
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862